

BEVERLEY TUCKER,  
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 1, 1856.

FOR PRESIDENT,  
JAMES BUCHANAN,  
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Subject to the Decision of the National Convention.

## THE "RICHMOND ENQUIRER" AND PRESIDENT PIERCE.

The Richmond *Enquirer* of Saturday last has a well written leader in defence of General Pierce, and in condemnation, of course, of all those who do not regard him as immaculate as itself. There is a temperateness about the article which invites a rejoinder in the same spirit. We, therefore, have determined to expose the fallacies with which the article, we are constrained to say, abounds, but to maintain good temper and becoming fairness in doing so.

We regret to say that we cannot precisely agree with our contemporary's idea of the "independent neutrality" of the *Enquirer*, which, like the Washington *Union*, it seems to have resolved to exercise "in the struggle for the nomination of the Cincinnati Convention." It is our misfortune, perhaps, to be too practical, and to have paid too little attention to metaphysical distinctions. Hence we must be excused for not exactly seeing an "independent neutrality" in a paper advocating the claims of no particular candidate for the nomination, and the editor of the same paper vouchsafing to the Democracy of Virginia an elaborate pamphlet recommending but one individual for that position. It is not the mere paper and ink that gives direction and influence to a political journal; it is the opinions and sentiments of its conductors and editors. And if these publish a pamphlet taking a different course from the paper itself, it may at least be regarded as a supplement to that paper. When is it that the Richmond *Enquirer* will not henceforth be regarded as a Pierce paper—an editor is more than human if he can be as warmly in favor of a candidate for the Presidency as one friend of the *Enquirer* has shown himself to be of General Pierce—if he can so master his impulses as to prevent his preferences from peeping out even in the paper itself?

After announcing its intention to be the guardian-general of the private and public characters of every distinguished and trusted Democrat, (a goodly work it has chalked out for itself,) the *Enquirer* goes on to protest against the attacks on President Pierce, in which certain journals in the interest of Mr. BUCHANAN incessantly indulge. We waive its epithets of "treacherous friends," because we are quite sure we were not meant to be embraced in this category. Treachery implies a breach of faith, of confidence, of actions running counter to professions. The accusation will not lie against us, as we never had the fortune, good or bad, to occupy any such relation to his Excellency Franklin Pierce.

Further, the *Enquirer* assumes the high position for General Pierce of "acknowledged Chief and Representative of the Democratic party" and further, it asserts "his Administration to be a Democratic Administration." Now, to these two propositions we take issue with the *Enquirer*. To be the "Chief and Representative of the Democratic party," the acts of his Administration must accord closely with the principles of that party. Only so long as he preserves this relation can he entitle himself to so grandiloquent a title. Has he preserved it? shall be our present inquiry. Now, we propose to make the investigation more brief, by asking a few plain and simple questions of the *Enquirer* itself.

General Pierce came into power almost by acclamation. The harmony of the Democratic party was so complete that it had almost broken up anything like an organized opposition. In a few short months his anti-Democratic course, by interfering with, and employing his patronage to effect, State elections, produced the first blast of discord and revolt. What was this? The New York controversy of Harbors and Sifts, as it was termed.

Now, we ask the *Enquirer* if it considered the course of the Administration in this particular wise or Democratic? Did the *Enquirer* relish the vitalization, which was the immediate result of this policy, of the whole Free-soil party in the North? Did not the peans that went up from this party and its organs everywhere, in gratitude to Franklin Pierce, grate harshly upon the ears of our contemporary? Was he not our coadjutor, and able coadjutor, for months in the most earnest reconstruction and condemnation of the prostration of the constitutional men of the North, which was the confessed result of this anti-Democratic and unpatriotic act of this man whom he has anointed as the great "Chief and Representative of the Democratic party?" Let his own columns answer. Then surely in this we have sinned not more than the editor of the *Enquirer* against the great chief.

Were not the constitutional sensibilities of the *Enquirer* equally shaken with our own at the proposition of two members of the cabinet, and in the hearing of this "Chief of the Democratic party," to construct a Pacific railroad out of Government means? How long would Old Hickory have stood by in silence at such vandalism upon one of the most prominent and cardinal principles in the States' rights' creed? Was this being the "Representative of the Democratic party?" Let the *Enquirer* consult its own columns again for its opinion of this heresy. Free trade and opposition to a protective tariff is one of the principles which go to make up the Democratic party, and yet this wonderful "Chief and Representative of the Democratic party" permitted his own Secretary of the Treasury (who had before pledged the surplus in the treasury to the construction of a railroad to the Pacific) to recommend in his report the establishment of the most odious feature in the revenue system, to wit: the protective feature! Did, or does, the Richmond *Enquirer* commend this act as one of the cluster which constitute the claim of Franklin Pierce to be regarded as the great Chief and Representative of the Democratic party?

We have too good an opinion of our Richmond contemporary's States-rights' opinions to charge it upon him.

The two Territories of Nebraska and Kansas were to be organized, and a bill for that purpose was reported by Judge Douglas. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the other features of the bill met our warm approval, and the *Enquirer* and *Sentinel* fought side by side in the terrific contest that ensued. We will not do more than allude to the course of the President and his organ, the Washington *Union*. The former electioneering for the bill as a bill for freedom, while the latter would at one time advocate the bill—at another, violently denounce the amendment repealing the Missouri Compromise—then making this same amendment a test of Democracy—then, for the purpose of being elected Printer to the House, declaring the Nebraska bill to be no test of Democracy—indicating every reasonable opposition to it—pronouncing that every Democrat who might use his utmost power to defeat the Nebraska bill was as good a Democrat as Bright, Slidell, and Brown, and should be kept in as good communion and fellowship as those gentlemen themselves! When the bill, however, passed, the President signed it, but still continued in high and numerous offices the men of that fraction of the party who so traitorously opposed it! But in the organization of the Territories it was confidently expected that Kansas or the southern Territory would be organized by southern officers, while the opposite policy would be pursued towards Nebraska. Not so, however. The unnatural policy was adopted by the President, which has resulted not only in danger and trouble—ceaseless it may be—to the emigration from the two sections of the country, but has clearly endangered the admission of Kansas as a slave State! Now, we ask our friend of the *Enquirer* if it is prepared to justify this course of the "chief," or to reconcile the fatal inconsistencies which marked it? It has, we admit, an offset to all this in the special message of the President twelve months after the damage was done, and even then not basing his removal of Governor Reeder upon the true ground, to wit: his hearty affiliation with the Free-soilers, and his co-operation with the nefarious purposes of the "Emigrant Aid Societies!" Does the *Enquirer* endorse and approve the treacherous conduct of the Administration to our three distinguished representatives abroad, in the Ostend Conference, which excited the indignation not only of the whole country, but of these gentlemen themselves? What would our contemporary have thought, if, in his late embassy, his obedience to his instructions of his own Government was made the cause of repudiation and reproach to him? Still the cases are quite analogous. This, then, is the boasted Democratic Administration at whose head stands this vaunted "Chief and Representative of the Democratic party!" Is there no cause, too, for the fragmentation of the Democratic party throughout the country—no cause for the predominance in the popular branch of Congress of the Black Republicans, and in the Senate of the United States for the great increase of Free-soilers? Surely it lies at some one's door, and at whose but this famous "Chief of the Democratic party?" Again, says the *Enquirer*, "The Cincinnati Convention will endorse President Pierce, and the Democracy will go into the fight on the issues presented by his Administration;" and again: "The party would not, if it could, get rid of the responsibility for the acts of this Administration!" We are glad to know that our contemporary is not to be deemed as speaking by the card for either the Cincinnati Convention or the Democratic party, when he so positively makes these assertions. The Cincinnati Convention will not, we believe, place upon the name it presents to the American Democracy any such crushing incubus as an endorsement of President Pierce! It will not so stultify its action, if it does so, in presenting another name than his, (for we hold that there is no constitutional inflexibility for a second term;) and if the Cincinnati Convention, therefore, are prepared to endorse Mr. Pierce and his acts, it should renounce him. This would not be just to General Pierce, but it would be due to the country. Nor will the party go into the fight on the "issues" presented by the Administration." We have enumerated some (for space does not allow us to proceed) of these "issues," and we undertake to say that if such want of wisdom is displayed, our Democratic champions will have a hard road to travel.

But we come now to the point the *Enquirer* makes, which is so decidedly cool that it provoked our mirth. It charges substantially that the friends of Mr. BUCHANAN have commenced this made of warfare, when it is fully demonstrable that Mr. Pierce himself inaugurated it as far back as the Ostend Conference! Ever since that time to the present, Franklin Pierce has instigated and invented the most insidious and disreputable attacks upon Mr. BUCHANAN, not only through his own mouthpiece, but even in his own conversations. We make this charge: that General Pierce has told delegates to the National Convention, that if he did not get the nomination himself, no northern man should have it—clearly pointing to Mr. BUCHANAN, who, except Judge Douglas, is the only "northern man" spoken of, and if report be true the relations of the latter are greatly changed towards the Administration.

Now, we appeal to the candor of our contemporary of the Richmond *Enquirer*, if this is not the most flagrant assault upon Mr. BUCHANAN, and calculated and intended to frighten the timid supporters of that gentleman into the advocacy either of Pierce himself, or the happy elect upon whom he intends to cast his mantle! Does the *Enquirer* doubt this—if it does and will say so, we will prove it by witness that the *Enquirer* will not feel at liberty to discredit. We call upon General Pierce's man Friday, of the Washington *Union*, to deny it. And yet the *Enquirer* talks of the necessity that may arise for the friends of General Pierce to retaliate upon Mr. BUCHANAN. We say come on, with all our heart—our candidate has not only our confidence but the confidence and respect of the whole nation. If there be any wicked way in him begin your retaliation. It is not honest to keep it back—out with it—expose it—let us know it. But he is above any successful retaliatory battery. He stands before the American people encircled by the wall of their affections and confidence. They have made up their minds to have him for their next Chief Magistrate; Franklin Pierce and his

seventy millions of government patronage, to the contrary, notwithstanding. But we come now to the last point of the *Enquirer's* article which we propose to notice. The *Enquirer* says: "these assaults upon President Pierce have no countenance from Mr. BUCHANAN, and we have no doubt he will promptly rebuke the selfish and destructive zeal of pretended friends." We have not taken the pains to enquire whether our assaults upon President Pierce are agreeable to Mr. BUCHANAN or not, nor do we intend to do so. "We hold a charter illegitimate as the winds, to blow on whom we please." Mr. BUCHANAN is too wise a man to suppose for a moment that his "presence" in the country could change what we believe to be the true policy to effect our earnest, sincere, (not "pretended") desire to see him elected to the Chief Magistracy of the Union. He is, it is true, not in the least degree responsible for our course—it is all our own, and we shall continue it notwithstanding the new-born apprehensions of our friend of the *Enquirer*, lest Mr. BUCHANAN should be injured by his indiscreet friends.

The article of the *Enquirer* too plainly points to us as one of those whom it meant to embrace in its strictures, and hence we have chosen, without ceremony or apology, to reply.

## NATURAL HISTORY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES.

In view of the approaching Presidential contest, we would beg to suggest to writers of reflective mind and analytic turn, as fine a field in the classification of Presidential candidates, as was opened to Audubon in the unexplored Zoology and Ornithology of this country.

These candidates are of all colors, calibres, magnitude, and exiguity. We have them of all sizes, from the "little giant" to the "little dwarf"; and, by the way, they are reported, as in the fable, to be about to take the field together. We have them of all hues and shades; we have them black, we have them white, we have them parti-colored. We have them in full feather, we have them without a feather to fly with. We have Northern men who court the South, and Southern men who court the North, and we have one nondescript specimen, at least, who intrudes into half a dozen varieties—who courts the South in words and the North in deeds, who is no color, or, what is the same thing, chameleon-like, of all colors; black, white, or piebald in succession, and who, before the election closes, may yet look blue, or who might be defined as white about the mouth, dark in the skin, and as having never shown any feather at all, on which his party can plume itself, because he has never shown but one, and that a white one.

The first analytic explorer in this interesting region will further find a class of aspirants whose expectations are shared by large numbers through the United States, and another who have their small minority widely scattered through the Union. A class with a large local or sectional support, and another with a small local and sectional support, till, in this endless variety, we come, from the man whose hopes are shared only by a small domestic circle, down to the individual whose latent aspirations are unshared and would be unparticipated in beyond his own expansive bosom.

In this mere suggestive notice to the enterprising and curious, of course, we are only tempted to notice the phenomena, and therefore, we will pause to remark, that the candidate "nameless and never to be named" who would get no vote beyond his own, though assuredly possessed by an ambition greater than his wit, is not necessarily new, as he would formerly have been, a mere monomaniac; for have not events of the last four years shown him the example, not only a man pithforked from obscurity into that coveted station, but what is more, after nearly four years exhibition of his insignificance, still, with hopes, partisans, and supporters, at least amongst spoilsmen and their tail?

Truly this field of classification is so vast that we retire diffidently from it with the conviction of inadequacy to the task, but in the hope that when explored, the most interesting branch of the subject will not be overlooked. We need but advert to the oval or chrysalis state of the candidate in relation to his Presidential development. For surely it will not be least interesting to know whether the egg will hatch at all, whether the terrapin or the eagle will peep from the shell when it hatches, and whether the caterpillar is the silk-worm, or will emerge from obscurity into the moth which preys upon the banner of the stars and stripes.

We would remind the investigator that there is the candidate who would make a good President but a bad candidate, and in this respect must be considered a "bad egg." That there is the candidate who will make a good President and a good candidate, and in this respect is throughout a good egg, and that there is the candidate who would make a bad candidate and a worse President, and in this respect is the worst kind of egg, because the best the country could hope from it is that it should be added. A specimen of the first might be found about the latitude of Virginia—the second he would probably have to seek in a middle region sometimes called the Keystone State, and the third he could conveniently pick up on his way through Washington—if he makes haste—if not, that is to say, if he delays beyond November next, he will have to travel after it to New Hampshire.

The New York *News* (Dickinson,) copies with great gusto the following well merited castigation of the Washington *Union*, (Pierce) from the Rochester *Advertiser*, (Douglas.)

The Washington *Union* falsely professes to stand impartial between the claims of candidates for the Democratic Presidential Nomination. The Rochester *Advertiser* thus exposes the hollow pretence:

"As a sample of its entire partiality, the *Union* on Friday last published an editorial, covering more than a column in its ample pages, professedly devoted to a discussion of the question of availability, but in truth to the support of the claims of President Pierce to a re-nomination. In the prosecution of this 'labor of love,' the position of the Free-soilers of New York and of the North was recklessly falsified—by boldly and mendaciously assuming that they were and are firm and consistent supporters of the Kansas act, when the reverse is known to be true. But not contented with this, that same paper stigmatizes the true supporters of the non-interference policy as 'spoiling Democrats,' thus adding insult to injury, and the more dastardly because of the pretence of entire impartiality as to candidates!"

## EXECUTIVE DICTATION AND CONGRESSIONAL PRESUMPTION.

Andrew Jackson came into power upon the overthrow of Congressional caucuses, and inaugurated the convention system. There was much wisdom in taking from such intriguing cabals the control of interests so important to the common weal of the country. The abuses that have gradually crept into the latter system, unless at once sternly rebuked by the people, will prove that we have only swapped a "devil for a witch," for we find now, harmoniously blended, the Executive with some of the National Legislators, for the purpose of stifling the popular voice, and making the creatures the dictators of the sovereign. To this we object; we remonstrate against it as anti-republican—subversive of the approved system of our Government, and in positive default of the spirit of our free institutions. We hate demagoguism, especially that kind of demagoguism that seeks to govern the popular will by flattery, hypocrisy, and deceit. Appeals to the passions and the prejudices of the people, have too often their foundation in the miserable objects and purposes of political tricksters. This is the other extreme, which is equally reprehensible. But it is our purpose, this morning, to show how entirely the people have parted with their immunities as the only sovereigns of this free land of ours, if they shall fail to be aroused from their lethargy and resent their modern but most offensive mode of their political representatives who presume to dictate to them the man whom they shall have to rule over them. Of Executive dictation we have before spoken. Indeed, so insolently has it run riot, that it has not been content with the base employment of the people's money to subjugate the people's will, but it has been deemed necessary to resort even to the personal pledges of the President himself to effect its nefarious ends. Nor does it seem to have made the slightest impression upon the public mind, that these personal pledges of our Presidential lobbyist have not only been disregarded, but absolutely had never the least foundation for them in fact! The law which punishes the man who obtains money under false pretences, does its mission; but there is a blank in the political statute-book, which allows to go unwhipped of justice the political felon who prostitutes even his private honor for his political designs! This may not be amended; but as long as we have the power to drive a quill, we will hold up all such monsters or *lucras nature* to popular indignation and popular horror. There is no morality in squinting at these deformities, because, forsooth, they exist in the President of the United States. Nor is it a valid or reputable excuse, to say that the interests of the party require us to pass them without notice. The Democratic party has lost all its charms for us when it shall inaugurate into its platform any such hideous principle. It is because we believe in its integrity, that we come thus to its rescue from the domination of the personal and political corruption in its present rulers. Let senators and members of the House repose, if they can, quietly upon the couch of consolation which bids them hope that the scales will not fall from the eyes of the people, their only legitimate rulers! Those scales shall fall—that firm shall be removed, even if we have to be the political oculist, and we alone, to remove them. We do not intend to allow recommendations, manifestoes, pamphlets, bulletins, pronouncements, worthy of Mexican or Costa Rican brigand rulers, to go out to their constituents without exposure from us. Is that man fit to be President of the United States who has not the personal confidence of one-twentieth of the members of the Democratic party in either house of Congress? Has not each one a tale to tell of the personal bad faith of Franklin Pierce to him? Let our amiable neighbor, the Washington *Union*, who has been so kind to notice us after nearly three years of sullen silence, answer. Some timid and shaky, but honest friends, say to us, "don't strike a prostrate man. Franklin Pierce is dead." To such, we say now and once for all, that we know he is dead—we know he is prostrate, but we do not intend to allow his corpse to be galvanized into life with another form! Our tomahawk and implements of war are sharpened and brightened for the first man that attempts to rise upon his unburied political ashes! We will war upon him more strenuously than upon the present evil. "Take any other shape but this!" And hence it is for the reason that we desire to see none of the eminent men of our party, whose names have been so prominently mentioned in connection with the nomination at Cincinnati, blind enough to their own, their country's, and their party's interest, to walk into such a dead fall!

So much for Franklin Pierce and his "Executive dictation."

We now come to the legislative, or congressional branch of our criticism. We term this "Congressional presumption." Is it not so? Scarcely a day passes that some member of Congress, who, instead of attending to the more direct interests of the country and his constituents, presumes to dictate to the latter, how, and for whom, they are expected, by his highness, to exercise the elective franchise which the constitution has given them the right to enjoy. As we have just said the mediums which these self-appointed dictators of the people use are letters, bulletins, pronouncements, and pamphlets. Multiplied mail bags are called in to requisition to disseminate these frank documents to the honest people of their districts, and thus the appointment of a *cadet*, or any other *disinterested* politeness upon the part of the Executive, may constitute a sufficient reason for an effort to sway the will and influence the judgments of thousands of honest men, who discover, only when it is too late, the imposture. The Democratic Convention has been removed from Baltimore because of its contiguity to the Central Power. Its next session is to be held in Cincinnati, though even this is not sufficiently distant to avoid the unprincipled machinations of the Executive and members of Congress. This should be corrected. But how? Such is the power of the Federal Government, inflated by an unwholesome increase of patronage, that we cannot hope to escape its influence even there.

The next move will be to San Francisco, we hope—when, perhaps, the Rocky Mountains may impose a sufficient obstacle to the insolent strides of Executive and Congressional meddling. Failing here, we would commend some eligible point in Nicaragua, the infant

government of our quondam American brethren, who have by their valour won so much renown, and acquired so glorious a country, in which the acorn of Democracy is to be planted from our own national tree. Here, at least, we should be safe, by the kindness of Messrs. Pierce and Marcy, who have stopped all intercourse between our own and their government. We do not, however, believe too strongly in the gullibility of the people. Members of Congress may write and frank what they please, but at last the self-respect, dignity, and even self-preservation, of the honest people will be aroused to the insidious attempts to enslave them.

Already, the action of District Conventions is chronicled, where it has been diametrically opposed to the suggestions or dictations of their Congressional representatives. It is a proper rebellion and a pertinent rebuke. Members of Congress will, therefore, put an instant stop to this habit, and will be content to remember that they have much to be thankful for already, without officiously interfering with the free will and judgment of those who gave them their only political importance. Let them also remember that if the vices of the President are to be smothered—and virtues which they know do not adorn his character, are to be paraded by insincere eulogists, we will, in our love for the people and our regard for the integrity of our party, strike the impostor, flatterer and parasite, wherever he rears his head.

## THEY WISH, HARRY, WAS FATHER TO THE THOUGHT—COME NOW AND LET US REASON TOGETHER.

We have read the comments of many papers upon our strictures upon the Executive. Very many of them have chosen to do so for the purpose of condemning them, and then to throw upon Mr. BUCHANAN the entire responsibility of our course towards the Executive. They purport to depreciate our course, because they regret that the inevitable result will be—that because the *Sentinel* has censured that portion of the Executive career which has never had Democratic endorsement, that, therefore, as a consequence inevitable, every one who may have any regard for Gen. Pierce must abandon and oppose Mr. BUCHANAN.

If the wish were not father to the thought, such illogical logic could never have found entrance into honest hearts having companionship of intelligent heads.

Our life upon it—in every instance this pretended regard for Mr. BUCHANAN comes from parties who have other first choice. No genuine friend of Mr. BUCHANAN would seek to saddle him with our sins, if sin we have committed—but with one accord deprecate and disavow in toto the attributing to him any portion of our error, if error we have committed.

Mark the result—mark where these commentators, pseudo friends of Mr. BUCHANAN, will be found; this standing under the fifth rib, while with smiling countenance he is addressed—"We hope it is well with thee, brother."

If they were the friends of Mr. BUCHANAN, they would say with one voice and one accord, that Mr. BUCHANAN is in no manner responsible, and that there was no truer test of who is his enemy, than thus most unjustly and most wickedly to attribute to him a responsibility which can by no honest construction be attached to him.

But let us turn the tables on these hypocritical gentlemen, and apply their own reasoning to themselves.

We all know that for years the Washington *Union* has been the selected organ, the authorized channel of Executive purpose, of Executive defence—publicly and privately so acknowledged.

Now, then, by a parity of reasoning, but applying with immeasurably more force to the *Union* as the organ of the Executive, than the *Sentinel*, an humble, though zealous advocate of Mr. BUCHANAN—in what category will our lecturers be found?

The Executive, through his organ, seeks to narrow all claim to notice by the Cincinnati Convention to the single point—"Did he take official part by vote or signature of the Nebraska Bill." If he did neither then was he to be ruled out of the course. The *Union* and its confederates thus sought summarily to exclude Mr. BUCHANAN, by seeking to have adopted a rule which would completely ignore him before the Convention—and yet these same parties who seek by this mode to certainly exclude him even from consideration at Cincinnati, profess to be horrified at the danger to which we subject him, by censures on so much of the Executive's conduct as has never received Democratic endorsement. Why, if the rule urged by the commentators on our strictures be adopted, Mr. BUCHANAN is nowhere, and our strictures, if ever so unjust, and properly attributed to Mr. BUCHANAN, would do him no harm, because the rule adopted or sought to be enforced by these commentators, had already effectually cut him off even from consideration. These remarks would show the hollowness of this pretended solicitude about Mr. BUCHANAN's being rejected by the Cincinnati Convention because the Washington *Sentinel* has criticised General Pierce's course.

Is it possible—have the strictures of the *Sentinel* this potential effect? Or is it that wish which is father to the thought, that so represents, it because it would so have it? Because the Washington *Sentinel* prefers Mr. BUCHANAN to General Pierce, and disapproves of much of General Pierce's course, therefore Mr. BUCHANAN must be rejected by the Cincinnati Convention! That is the sum and substance of the argument—its alpha and omega. Well, carry out this reasoning. The *Sentinel* prefers Mr. Hunter to General Pierce, and censures General Pierce's course, therefore Mr. Hunter must be ruled off. The *Sentinel* prefers Judge Douglas, prefers Governor Wise, prefers Senator Rusk, prefers General Cass, and prefers others to General Pierce, and will advocate their selection in preference, whenever it shall be between any one of them and General Pierce. Each or any one would be equally responsible for our strictures as is Mr. BUCHANAN; they, then, also must be ruled off the course! Truly, then, we are the only real efficient friend General Pierce has, because it will only be by the adoption of this rule, to exclude whoever the *Sentinel* prefers to General Pierce, that he can approach success in nomination.

But again: the Executive and the *Union* have sought to make fidelity to the Kansas-Nebraska bill the test for a nomination. If the

*Sentinel*, which has never claimed to be an organ of Mr. BUCHANAN, whose editor had never exchanged words with him, and which disavows any right to attach responsibility to Mr. BUCHANAN for anything said by it, is to be the death of Mr. BUCHANAN, the *Union*, really the organ of the Executive, must stand for its exponent.

Well, in regard to this very Kansas bill, the *Union* did denounce the amendment repealing the Missouri Compromise; the *Union* did, by authority, officially absolve all Democrats from any blame who should, by all means in their power, seek to defeat it. The Executive, through the *Union*, officially proclaimed it to be no test; that it was, in fact, a matter of so little importance to the Executive, that if these free-soil recusants would elect the editor of the *Union* as Printer to the House, he would sell them absolution for any reason they might commit against the Democratic party upon this vital test question. The consequence was, that these men, having purchased immunity for treason, set themselves to work to hamstring the Democratic party, and the hardest fight against the bill was made by these renegades with "Executive indulgences" in their pockets.

Here was a most treasonable and dangerous attack upon the Democratic party by the President and the *Union*, the latter of which received the price of the treason.

Is reason like this to the Democratic party a lighter offence than strictures upon the exceptional portion of the Executive conduct? According to these sapient commentators on our strictures, there is no crime in this treason to the Democratic party by the *Union* and the Executive; the Executive has a *carte blanche* to betray the Democratic party at pleasure. The Executive has a right to fill the coffers of the *Union*, its organ, at the expense of the Democratic party. The Executive has a right to sell "indulgences" to traitors, who tell him their purpose is to defeat Democratic test measures. All these are mere outrages upon the Democratic party by the Executive. The treason, the only treason, in the opinion of our commentators, is in the *Sentinel's* strictures upon this treason.

We have before us this extraordinary spectacle. Papers professing to be Democratic who, in silence see the covert treason perpetrated against the Democratic party, are loud-mouthed against the *Sentinel*, and for what? for treason to the Democratic party? No; but because the *Sentinel* says this treason to the Democratic party, in its time of greatest need, is reason why they who authorized and justified and abetted it should not have the preference over all distinguished statesmen.

## THE UNION, THE PRESIDENT, AND THE SENTINEL.

We have already noticed the *Union's* baseless assertion, that the columns of the *Sentinel* for two years manifested "a consistent and persistent abuse and vituperation of the President."

We revert to it again, to challenge the *Union* to produce from the columns of the *Sentinel* any censure of any act, or any writing of the Executive or the Administration, which had the approval of the Democratic Party.

It can produce none such. We challenge the *Union* to name any measure, or any writing or document, of the Executive or Cabinet, which had the approval of the Democratic Party, and which did not receive commendation from the *Sentinel*.

It can produce none such. The *Sentinel* spoke in terms of unqualified approbation of the Inaugural Address, and of the last annual and special messages. The *Sentinel* said that these documents offered a platform with ample room and verge enough for every Democrat to stand upon. They were not only correct in principle, but they presented the matters contained therein, in a style eminently masterly, and to their authors, whoever they be, great credit is due.

But with these words ends the record of the Executive's virtuous course—these were mere words—*ex eâ proterea nihil*.

If beyond these documents, written we know not by whom, the Executive has done anything to challenge commendation from any other source than the *Union*, our memory does not serve us.

If, therefore, it thus appears, we have never censured the Executive for any act or document which has met the approval of the Democratic Party, and that we have never failed to give a hearty and generous approval of all that he has done or written which has been approved by the Democratic Party, we opine that the sweeping declaration of the *Union* as to our "consistent and persistent abuse and vituperation," falls to the ground, leaving our neighbor in the attitude of a very inconsiderate accuser.

The New York *News* (Dickinson,) evidently takes great pleasure in reproducing the following insidious attacks upon Mr. BUCHANAN, from the Chicago *Times*, (Douglas,) and from the Fredericksburg *Recorder*, (Hunter.) We gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity to clip from these journals all that they can say against the candidate of our choice, that our readers may see how little and shallow are their objections. So impotent are they, that they require no refutation at our hands. It is all right for the Pierce, Douglas and Hunter presses to misrepresent Mr. BUCHANAN, and for Senatorial aspirants for the Presidency to denounce us as a disorganizer, although we confine ourselves to the pleasant, legitimate, and virtuous task of exposing the enormities of this imbecile Administration.

[From the New York *News*.]

Shall the Kansas Nebraska Bill be a Test. The Chicago *Times*, commonly supposed to speak the views of the friends of Senator Douglas, quotes the following language from Mr. BUCHANAN's late letter to Senator Slidell, for the purpose of commenting thereon:

"The Missouri Compromise is gone, and gone forever. But no assault should be made upon those Democrats who maintained it, provided they are now willing in good faith to maintain the settlement as it exists. Such an understanding is wise and just in itself."

Whereupon the *Times* goes on to denounce this platform as offering an amnesty to the Hales, the Nilees, the Wilcoits, the Growns, and the rest of the Northern Free Soilers. It does not name the New York *Softs*—whether because it does not suppose they are included in the proposed amnesty, we cannot say. As to Illinois, the *Times* continues:

"The Democracy of Illinois, acting upon the principle that a man who, for office, has once

bargained away his honor, truth and manhood, and has consorted with the avowed enemies of the Constitution, will do the same thing again upon the first opportunity, regard the traitors of 1854—the men who used to 'maintain the Missouri Compromise'—as men not to be trusted with political power, even if they were to become the advisers and the personal body-guard of Illinois Governor Adams."

At Cincinnati, it "trusts that out of devotion and respect to the Constitution itself, our candidates will be men who may demand popular favor by exhibiting the scars they have received in defense of that Constitution, and not men who wish to be considered available, because they can swell the ranks of their followers by promises of a free pardon."

"We also find in the Fredericksburg (Virginia) *Recorder*, a paper having the name of Robert M. T. Hunter for President, at the head of its columns, an able article claiming that a Southern man ought to be nominated for that high office at this time, and that such a man was known to have been friendly to the Kansas Nebraska bill before its passage, and whose merit is not a simple acquiescence in legislation which he cannot prevent—an acquiescence only indicated after all hopes of resistance have faded out. The *Recorder* gives its opinion in brief, thus:

"We have no tolerance for the cowardly and compromising policy of selecting a candidate who presents the unfortunate merit of having been withdrawn from the field of battle." "So far as these considerations affect Presidential candidates whether it be Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Douglas, or Mr. Hunter, we do not propose to speak of them. Each of those distinguished Democrats will be ably represented and defended on all issues that can be brought forward. It is, therefore, by no means with reference to the attitude of any one of them, and certainly not out of hostility to any one of them, that we have reported our own remarks of the *Times* and the *Recorder* at this time."

We clip the following from the Chicago *Times*. The cunning way in which they reproduce our attacks upon General Pierce, is amusing, very. But it strikes us that it would be more chivalric in the Editor that leads the column for the gallant Little Giant to give his own opinions of General Pierce and not content himself by silently quoting ours. No skulking the responsibility gentlemen.

Anybody but Pierce. The Philadelphia *Pennsylvaniaan*, (Forney's paper,) which supports Buchanan's nomination, says it will support any nominee of the Democratic Convention with the exception of Franklin Pierce, and adds:

"All the Democratic presses in the land, with a sea of ink to back them, would not be able to successfully defend Franklin Pierce from some of his outrageous acts, not yet made public."

The above appeared in the Chicago *Tribune* of yesterday. The *Pennsylvaniaan* is a supporter of Mr. Buchanan, but it never made any such assertion as the above. But we suppose the truth or falsity of the matter "is of no consequence" to the *Tribune*.

When a leading Black Republican organ, the New York *Daily Times*, thus speaks of the free-soil champion of the Topeka convention, he must indeed be fallen to the lowest depth of depths:

Senator Douglas and Col. Lane. Upon another page we publish a letter from Senator Douglas, concerning a demand made upon him by Col. J. H. Lane, of Kansas, for an explanation of language he had used in debate.

The history of this affair is as follows: On the 8th instant a memorial was presented to the Senate by Gen. Cass, purporting to be signed by the members elect of the Kansas (Free State) Legislature. On the 9th it was alleged that the signatures could not be genuine, inasmuch as they were all written in one hand. The memorial was accordingly rejected. Subsequently Col. LANE sent into the Senate a petition, accompanied by the original memorial of which the one previously presented was alleged to be a copy. This was referred to the Committee on Territories, of which Mr. Douglas was chairman. Upon examination Mr. Douglas found, as he alleges, that, instead of being a copy, the original had been greatly and materially altered; and upon that statement it was again rejected.

On the 18th, Col. Lane addressed to Mr. Douglas a letter, (subsequently embodied in his card, published in the *Times* of Friday last,) recriminating him that, previous to his republishing the conversation, he had told Mr. Douglas that it "was prepared under his direction," in conformity with the authority vested in him;—and complaining that Mr. Douglas, in this frank explanation, should still have repeated his charge that the memorial had been essentially and materially altered since its signature. Col. Lane therefore asks of him "such an explanation of his language upon that occasion as will remove all imputation upon the integrity of his action or intention in connection with that matter." This was referred to the Committee on Territories, of which Mr. Douglas was chairman. Upon examination Mr. Douglas found, as he alleges, that, instead of being a copy, the original had been greatly and materially altered; and upon that statement it was again rejected.